UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,404	08/30/2001	Douglas L. Sorensen	884.438US1	8246

7590 09/30/2005

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, NHON D

Eric S. Hyman, Esq.
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/943,404	SORENSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nhon (Gary) D. Nguyen	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 July 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19 and 21-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19 and 21-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

AT

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to amendment, filed 07/11/2005.

2. Claims 1-19 and 21-25 are pending in this application. In this amendment, claim 20 is canceled, claims 1, 8, 11-19, and 21-23 are amended, and no claim is added. This action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Li et al. ("Li", US 5,911,138).

As per claim 23, Li teaches a method for explaining search logic and results, comprising:

receiving a basis of a search, the basis comprising at least one item (search query 104 of fig. 3A);

presenting the basis in a retained-items list ("Price < 10", "Price < 14", "Name = BIG", and "store = "Fast Sales" in Query Window 101 of fig. 3A);

creating a similarity profile from the retained-items list (results1 107 of fig. 3A generates similarity profile as a result from the search query 104);

generating a suggested-items list from the similarity profile, the suggested items list comprising at least one item; presenting the suggested-items list as search results (102 of fig. 3A); and

providing an option to present the similarity profile (col. 10, lines 15-36);

As per claim 24, Li teaches:

receiving a selected item from the suggested-items list; receiving a request for presentation of the similarity profile for the selected item ; and presenting a presentation comparing the selected item to the similarity profile (from the search results in Graph Window 102 and Tree Window 103 of fig. 3A, creates new search presentation 130 and similarity profile 134 of fig. 3C) .

As per claim 25, Li teaches wherein presenting the presentation comparing the selected item to the similarity profile comprises:

computing a profile-word importance for each word in the similarity profile; presenting the profile-word importance for each word in the similarity profile; (computes from the similarity profile in the result 134 of fig. 3C, then generates graphical display in window 102 of fig. 3C to show how important of each word in the search query, such as "Price", "Name", and "store");

computing a degree of match for each word in the selected item in relation to the similarity profile using the profile-word importance; presenting the degree of match for each word in the selected item in relation to that same word in the similarity profile (computes the degree of

match for each word in the query 142 of fig. 3D such as "Price > 10", "Price < 14", "Name = BIG", and "store = Fast Sales", and then presents it in the search result 14 of fig. 3D).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-9, 11-13, 16, 19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of Banning et al. ("Banning", 5,421,008).

As per claims 1, 11, 19 and 21, Li teaches a computer implemented method and corresponding system for explaining search logic and results, comprising the steps/means:

presenting a presentation model (100 of fig. 3A) to explain how a system model (100 of fig. 3A) relates a plurality of search input elements ("Select * From CD_Sales" in Query Window 101 of fig. 3A) to a comparison element ("Price < 10", "Price < 14", "Name = BIG", and "store = "Fast Sales" in Query Window 101 of fig. 3A), wherein the system model is used to determine a first search result (107 of fig. 3A);

presenting how the system model is related to the comparison element (104 of fig. 3A); and

presenting a relative importance of the system model in comparison with the comparison element (Graph Window 102 shows how important the system model is in comparison with the comparison element in the Query Window 101).

Li does not disclose the comparison element is selected from a list of potential comparison elements. Banning teaches comparison element is selected from a list of potential comparison elements at col. 29, lines 10-25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Banning of selecting comparison element from a list of potential comparison elements in Li's system since it would have made it easier and faster to create comparison element.

As per claim 2, Li teachespresenting how parts of the system model are related to parts of the comparison element (Query 1 and Query 2 of fig. 3A and 3B respectively).

As per claim 3, Li teaches presenting a relative importance of the parts of the system model in comparison with parts of the comparison element (Graph Window 102 of fig. 3A and 3B respectively).

As per claim 4, Li teaches presenting how parts of each of the plurality of search input elements are related to parts of the system model (Query 1 and Query 2 of fig. 3A and 3B respectively).

As per claim 5, Li teaches presenting a relative importance of the parts of the plurality of search input elements in comparison with the parts of the system model (Graph Window 102 of fig. 3A and 3B respectively).

As per claim 6, it is inherent that Li's system saves the system model (query structure).

As per claims 7, 13, and 22, Li teaches:

receiving a modification to the plurality of search input elements to create a new plurality of search input elements (fig. 3D; col. 6, lines 10-11);

determining at least a second search result (14 of fig. 3D);

updating the system model to create a new system model incorporating the modification (100 of fig. 3D);

presenting how the new system model is related to the comparison element (142 of fig. 3D); and

presenting a new relative importance of the new system model in comparison with the comparison element (102 of fig. 3D).

As per claim 8, Li teaches a machine for explaining search logic and results, comprising:

a processor (22 of fig. 2);

a storage device coupled to the processor (26 of fig. 2);

a search component storable on the storage device and executable on the processor to accept at least one search input element ("Select * From CD_Sales" of fig. 3A) and determine a first search result using a system model (results1 107 of fig. 3A); and

a presentation component storable on the storage device and executable on the processor to create a presentation of a presentation model relating the system model to one of the first search result (102 and 103 of fig. 3A).

Li does not disclose the comparison element is selected from a list of potential comparison elements. Banning teaches comparison element is selected from a list of potential comparison elements at col. 29, lines 10-25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Banning of selecting comparison element from a list of potential comparison elements in Li's system since it would have made it easier and faster to create comparison element.

As per claim 9, Li teaches:

the processor is a server (col. 3, lines 14-24); and

further wherein the processor is capable of receiving the at least one search input element from a client (col. 3, lines 28-33).

As per claim 12, Li teaches:

presenting a contribution of parts of the comparison element to parts of the system model (Query 1 and Query 2 of fig. 3A and 3B respectively); and

presenting a relative importance of parts of the system model in comparison with parts of the comparison element (Graph Window 102 of fig. 3A and 3B respectively).

As per claim 16, Li teaches the application is a database application (col. 1, lines 64-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of Banning and further in view of Hsu (US 6,374,079).

As per claim 10, Li does not disclose the processor is capable of communicating in a wireless Internet environment. Hsu teaches a processor is adapted as an entry point onto network for wireless users having wireless Internet services (col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 8). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Hsu of processor capable of communicating in a wireless Internet environment in Li's system since it would be convenient and easy to adapt to wireless Internet technology.

9. Because applicant failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of Official Notice, the common knowledge in the art statement in the last Office Action is taken to be admitted prior art.

10. Claims 14, 15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of Banning and further in view of applicant's admitted prior art.

As per claims 14, 15, 17, and 18, Li does not disclose his explaining search queries are applied to electronic mail, Internet search engine, e-commerce, and document management. These features are taught by applicant's admitted prior art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to modify Li's explaining search queries to implement in

electronic mail, Internet search engine, e-commerce, and document management systems since it would have presented an overview of search presentation to users.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant argued the following:

(a) Li does not disclose either a "presentation model" or a "system model" as claimed.

(b) Li does not teach the comparison element comprises an element selected from a list of potential comparison elements.

Examiner disagree for the following reason:

(a) Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As claimed by the independent claims, the "presentation model" is used to explain how a system model relates a plurality of search input elements to a comparison element. The presentation shown in figure 3A is clearly a "presentation model" that includes three windows Query Window 101, Graph Window 102 and Tree Window 103. These three windows are used to explain (in query structure 101, tree hierarchical 103 and graph 102) how a search structure (or system model) relates a plurality of search input elements (e.g., search input elements from table CD_Sales) to a comparison element (e.g., "Price > 10", "Price < 14", "Name = BIG" and "store = Fast Sales"). Also, as claimed by the independent claims, the "system model" is used to determine a search result. In this case, the system model is merely a search structure such as the Query 1 in window 101 of figure 3A that is used to determine a search result 107. Therefore, Li clearly teaches a "presentation model" and a "system model" as claimed.

(b) Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)272-4139. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday with every other Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571)272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
September 21, 2005

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER